



Heriot-Watt University
Research Gateway

Maximising cruise tourism outcomes in small-medium cruise ports: lessons from Atlantic Canada

Citation for published version:

McCarthy, J 2018, 'Maximising cruise tourism outcomes in small-medium cruise ports: lessons from Atlantic Canada', *Urban Research and Practice*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 289-313.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2017.1339822>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1080/17535069.2017.1339822](https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2017.1339822)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Heriot-Watt Research Portal](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Urban Research and Practice

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Urban Research and Practice* on 13 June 2017, available online: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2017.1339822>

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via Heriot-Watt Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

Heriot-Watt University has made every reasonable effort to ensure that the content in Heriot-Watt Research Portal complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact open.access@hw.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Maximising Cruise Tourism Outcomes in Small-Medium Cruise Ports: lessons from Atlantic Canada

Dr John McCarthy

School of Environment, Geoscience, Infrastructure and Society

Heriot-Watt University

Riccarton

Edinburgh EH14 4AS

Tel 0131 451 8093

Email j.p.mccarthy@hw.ac.uk

The author acknowledges that this work was supported by the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland (grant no. 31801).

Maximising Cruise Tourism Outcomes in Small-Medium Cruise Ports: lessons from Atlantic Canada

Abstract

There has been significant growth in cruise ship tourism in recent decades, leading to benefits and problems for host ports, with most growth concentrated in small-medium cruise ports, and these have sought to develop policy and practice solutions which maximise net benefits from cruise tourism. The experience of the Atlantic Canadian ports of Halifax, Sydney and Saint John is illustrative in this context, for instance via the application of institutional partnership, appropriate infrastructure provision and management practices, and a diversity of uses close to the cruise terminal area. Such elements have implications for cruise ship tourism in other contexts.

Key words

Cruise ship

Tourism

Ports

Waterfronts

Introduction

The significant growth in cruise tourism in recent decades has led to a range of associated benefits for host cities, including economic benefits in particular (Ward 2014). Consequently, many cities have sought to encourage further growth in cruise ship visits and passenger numbers, for instance by increasing capacity by developing infrastructure such as cruise passenger terminals (McCarthy and Romein 2012). However, this growth in cruise tourism has also led to a range of problems for

many ports, linked for instance to pollution and overcrowding (Klein 2011), which, if unchecked, might erode the appeal of the host city for tourism in the future. There are also issues in relation to equity of outcomes, since many benefits may be exported outside host cities, while most costs are often borne by city residents (Brida et al. 2011). These concerns have led to attempts by many host cities to learn from the experience of cruise tourism elsewhere, including relevant policy and practice by municipalities and port authorities (McCarthy 2004, 2006; McCarthy and Romein 2012).

However, the literature surrounding these issues remains limited in scope, particularly for small-medium host cities away from the Caribbean and Mediterranean regions, since many of the reported studies have focused on larger ports in these regions (Andriotis and Agiomirgianakis 2010). This is problematic because much growth and associated problems in recent years has been in small-medium cities, and a significant proportion of growth in cruise tourism in the future may be assumed to be within such small-medium cities, for several reasons, as follows. First, many larger cities are reaching their capacity in terms of tourism numbers (McCarthy 2006). Second, there is increasing demand for a more authentic and smaller-scale experience of cruise tourism (Rodrigue and Notteboom 2013), which can often be best satisfied by the use of small-medium host cities. Third, it is in such small-medium cities where growth in cruise tourism can lead to the most severe problems, because of the high sensitivity and vulnerability of relatively small host city communities (Stewart et al. 2011). Nevertheless, there are many cases of small-medium host cities seeking to address these issues via innovative approaches and methods applied to maximise net benefits from cruise tourism, with potential implications for other host cities facing similar problems (Douglas and Douglas 2005).

This article provides evidence to assist in filling this gap in the available literature, by exploring examples of cities in Atlantic Canada that have applied such approaches and methods in the context of growing cruise tourism, in order to maximise net benefits. This, it is proposed, can inform wider debates on cruise tourism development and encourage improved policy and practice in sustainable

cruise tourism development, which is of critical importance to the future of many communities. The article considers the experience of cruise tourism in three host cities in Atlantic Canada, at a range of scales, comprising Halifax, Sydney and Saint John. The article is based upon a research project undertaken by the author and funded by the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland, which applied a qualitative approach using semi-structured interviews of key agents in each context, supplemented by analysis of documents including policy reports from relevant municipalities and port authorities.

The article is structured as follows. First, a review of relevant literature is presented in order to set the context for the research findings and analysis. Second, the research project context and methodology is set out. Third, the three sets of case study findings are considered, with each case involving consideration of organisational factors, terminal infrastructure, cruise ship demand, operational factors, and problems experienced and solutions applied. These factors were selected since they address the key underlying issues linked to the literature on the effects and implications of cruise tourism development in host ports. Fourth, the results are discussed with respect to the aims of the article, focusing on implications for potentially improved policy and practice for city municipalities and port authorities, using criteria developed from the review of literature. Finally, conclusions are suggested with potential relevance for the development of cruise tourism in other contexts.

Literature review

Cruise ship tourism as a sector has specific implications for many port cities globally. Expansion of cruise tourism since the 1960s has led to increased capacity in terms of cruise ships as well as cruise passenger terminals and related infrastructure, for instance for transportation provision (Weeden et al. 2011). More recently, niche cruise operators have exploited the changing perceptions and appeal

of cruise tourism by targeting a younger 'mass' consumer base, linked to more flexible itineraries, a longer cruise season, and provision of an ever-broadening range of facilities and activities for cruise tourists (both on- and off-ship). In addition, cruise ship tourism has often formed a key part of broader regeneration schemes for port cities, since it can help to provide an alternative to employment and income based on declining port or shipping activities, and can allow cities to make best use of advantages in relation to location, climate and historic heritage. In order to do this, many ports have invested in infrastructure such as cruise passenger terminals and public transport links between terminals and city centres.

However, the key benefits of cruise ship tourism – particularly income for port businesses and employment for port cities – has often been overestimated, particularly when economic leakage is considered (Reiner 2004). Furthermore, such benefits have often been matched by problems such as congestion, pollution and erosion of historic heritage (McCarthy 2004, 2006; McCarthy and Romein 2012). This has led in some instances to the case for public subsidy of infrastructure such as cruise passenger terminals to be called into question, and some have suggested that the costs of cruise tourism may exceed the benefits for host ports, implying that they should apply more rigorous conditions to cruise operators, such as minimum length of port stay period or taxation measures, in order to offset costs (Larsen and Wolff 2016). There are also inequities in the distribution of benefits and costs in relation to cruise ports, with benefits often accruing largely to stakeholders such as cruise operators (and often therefore being 'exported' away from host cities), while many costs are borne locally (Klein 2011; McCarthy 2006). Consequently, Klein (2011) asserts the need for impacts to be considered via the prism of 'sustainable tourism' (Butler 1999), leading to Klein's notion of 'responsible cruise tourism', which can address environmental and socio-cultural impacts as well as distribution of benefits.

As a result of these complex and contested issues, much research has been applied in recent decades to the benefits and problems of cruise ship tourism for host ports. However, this research has largely focused on the experience of large city ports, where ships begin and/or end a journey, since it is in such contexts that both benefits (such as visitor spend and repeat visits) and costs (such as pollution and congestion) are greatest and most visible, with notable examples such as the historic cities of Venice and Barcelona. In addition, as Andriotis and Agiomirgianakis (2010) illustrate, much of this research has focused geographically on the Caribbean region, since this has been the preferred cruise destination globally, and the Mediterranean region has also attracted significant attention. However, as Dowling (2011) notes, there is increasing demand for more remote and exotic destinations, with for instance Australia and New Zealand experiencing rapid growth in cruise tourism, leading to the development of new infrastructure such as cruise passenger terminals (Dowling 2011; CLIA Australia 2013). Such areas may experience more extreme effects on local communities, since, as Shone et al. (2017) show, such effects are particularly marked where there is a high rate and large scale of growth in cruise tourism.

In addition, many studies in relation to cruise tourism and effects on host cities focus on the perceptions of residents, for instance via their interpretation of benefits (or positive externalities) arising from cruise tourism development including economic benefits via increased income. They also identify problems (or negative externalities) arising from cruise ship tourism, including social problems such as increased congestion and criminality; environmental problems such as increased pollution and waste; and economic problems such as inequitable distribution of benefits – for instance with outside entrepreneurs rather than city residents gaining most benefits (see for instance Brida et al. 2011, 2012, 2014). Such studies also indicate that residents' attitudes to cruise ship tourism may change over time, with initially positive attitudes often giving way to later concern over long-term negative effects, for instance via a progression 'from euphoria to apathy, annoyance and, finally, antagonism as tourist development proceeds' (Brida et al. 2014: 181). This, Brida et al.

(2012, 2014) suggest, may be linked to a tourism life cycle model. Brida et al. (2013, 2014) highlight however that cases will be to a degree context-dependent so that lessons and suggestions may not translate or transfer easily between cities which differ markedly in terms of their geographical, historical, social, economic and other characteristics.

Nevertheless, Brida et al. (2014) point to the general implication that policy-makers should change their overall approach to encourage greater involvement of local businesses in cruise tourism, and consider residents' expectations in relevant decision making. Brida et al. (2011, 2012) also highlight the need to research and communicate more widely the balance between positive and negative aspects of tourism. However, it may be argued that it is desirable to go further, to investigate the specific policy and practice developments that might add value in this context, such as partnership working and visitor management and information, which might assist most directly in maximising net benefits to host cities. Few studies have attempted this.

The implication of these factors is that there is a clear gap in the literature in terms of documenting and evaluating the specific actions (including policy and practice) of municipalities and port authorities in developing and managing cruise ship tourism via the attempted optimisation of net benefits to the host cities (especially small-medium sized cities away from the Caribbean and Mediterranean regions). This article aims to begin to fill this gap. First, however, it is necessary to consider the context to cruise tourism and host city effects in more detail.

A critical factor in the context of cruise tourism and its effects is the particular role and status of the cruise port or host, since this affects the degree and nature of impacts from cruise ship tourism activity. In this context, 'transit' ports or 'ports of call' are simply stopping-off points on a cruise itinerary. Conversely, 'turnaround' ports are where ships begin or end a cruise journey by disembarking/embarking passengers, and where as a consequence ships may be provisioned for a

cruise (though ports may carry out both roles to a degree, as in the case of Halifax). In overall terms, 'turnaround' ports provide a greater opportunity than transit ports for visitor spending and economic development, since passengers may spend more time in the city, staying in local accommodation before or after a new cruise journey. However, such ports need a minimum provision of infrastructure including a suite area for customs and immigration, good road access for trucks and tankers for bunkering and provisioning, facilities for the removal of wastewater and waste, and facilities for passenger embarkation and luggage transfer. In the North Sea Region of Europe for example, a turnaround port is assumed to require a terminal with two floors, as well as discharge facilities for instance via gangways and public transport, and a pre-boarding waiting facility for passengers (European Union Gateway North Sea Project 2012). Clearly, only a limited number of transit ports could therefore seek to upgrade to a (possibly dual) function as 'turnaround' ports. By contrast, 'home ports' are those from which a ship operates regularly for a certain period of time such as a cruise season, for starting and/or ending cruise journeys. With the increasing prevalence of long-distance cruises which are separated into discrete segments, many 'turnaround' ports do not function as home ports.

While relatively little focus has been placed on the cruise ship tourism experience of small-medium cruise ports, which often function as transit ports (as in the three cases in this article, though again Halifax also functions as a turnaround port), it may nevertheless be argued that the experience of such ports is increasingly important. In fact, in many areas, small-medium 'ports of call' are the dominant cruise ports, and many do not aspire to become 'home ports' or even 'turnaround ports'. For instance, Scotland's experience of cruise ship tourism is focused largely on small-medium sized transit ports, such as Greenock, Invergordon, Dundee and Kirkwall (Orkney), and in 2015 there was an increase in cruise ship passenger visits to these ports of 14.8% on 2014, with a 9.6% increase in cruise ship visits and a 10% increase in passenger spending (Watson 2016). In addition, there is evidence globally of new niche cruise operators focusing on smaller ship cruises using small-medium

ports. Furthermore, it may be suggested that many problems (such as congestion) which have emerged as a result of fast-growing passenger and cruise ship numbers in larger ports could be ameliorated via displacement of cruise ship activities to small-medium ports, possibly encouraged by tourism policies at national or regional levels.

A further factor in this context is the fast-changing nature and demands of cruise ship tourism. Hence cruise lines are constantly seeking to update their itineraries (typically planned 24-36 months in advance) to enhance demand from passengers in a competitive environment. Indeed, cruise lines may cease their involvement with existing transit ports if passengers experience dissatisfaction with them (Andriotis and Agiomirgianakis 2010; Henthorne 2000) and such experiences may also impact on the likelihood of passengers returning either on another cruise or in another tourist mode (Duman and Mattila 2005; Gabe et al. 2006; Ross 1993). Consequently, countries such as Australia have sought to substantially upgrade infrastructure in order to exploit the consistently increasing demand from cruise ship passengers (Klein 2011; CLIA Australasia 2013).

This leads to the question of what cruise companies seek from a port of call, including for instance overall low operating costs. In fact, a study of the North Sea Cruise Region (European Union Cruise Gateway North Sea Project 2012) showed that cruise operators' criteria often prioritised the touristic attractions of the port rather than port infrastructure (such as shops and related attractions and/or cruise terminals) or operational initiatives (such as shuttle buses to the city centre) (Andriotis et al. 2007; Euthimiadou 2001). Certainly, on-shore activities and attractions play a critically important role in determining the satisfaction of tourists with the cruise tourism offer. Decisions on itineraries will also depend on factors such the scale and orientation of the cruise line, with the Carnival Corporation for instance prioritising factors such as the availability of bus tours as well as the capacity for effective disembarkation (particularly in view of the scale of their ships) using a fixed berth with a gangway. This corroborates the findings of Andriotis and Agiomirgianakis (2010), who

highlight the importance of efficient dissipation of passengers from the cruise ship to their preferred destination (or to allow them to explore privately) since time is often limited relative to the options available. Of course, many potential ports of call lack necessary infrastructure and so government support is often needed for its development, which (it may be claimed) is justified by the potential future income generation from passenger spending, head taxes and ship fees.

However, there are important differences between the needs/wishes of cruise operators, and those of ports and port communities. This is related in part to the distribution of costs (often borne locally) and benefits (often accruing away from the city). In addition, there are differences in perception of what is needed in host cities to encourage cruise tourism. For example, as indicated above, while cruise companies often do not prioritise port infrastructure or operational initiatives, local cities/communities (including port authorities) often prioritise these very elements, in their efforts to encourage cruise tourism. Such differences may be related to the need for cruise operators to maximise profits for instance by revenue from bus tours organised by them, since passengers using such tours do not need facilities in the terminal, and indeed cruise operators' income may be reduced where (competing) facilities/attractions are available. In this context, there is a clear asymmetry in power between cruise lines and ports, since cruise lines and operators can choose to relocate their itineraries and can seek to exploit the competition between potential host ports, to their advantage. This is highlighted in particular by Klein (2011) as a major factor underlying the obstacles faced by ports in attempting to maximise the advantages to them of cruise tourism activity.

Such differences may be seen also in provision of tourist information for instance via information kiosks within transit ports. While this was rated highly (62%) by ports, it was rated lowly (25%) by cruise lines (European Union Gateway North Sea 2012). Similarly, while public transport was rated highly (62%) by ports, it was rated lowly (22%) by cruise lines. Significantly, however, the issue of

potential crowding of ships/cruise passengers within ports was seen as important by cruise lines but not ports, with cruise lines generally willing to accept limits on the number of cruise passengers per day. This again may reflect the need for cruise lines to maximise revenue from tour buses, while ports may see large numbers of passengers as primarily a benefit in view of local income generation. Of course, local residential communities (as opposed to municipalities) may see this as a problem, depending on their proximity to cruise passenger terminals.

These factors are also related to the broader choices faced by port cities in attempting to promote tourism activity. As Smith and Ebejer (2011) show, such cities may face important choices in terms of whether to emphasise their international relevance or local significance. This is difficult, since on the one hand tourists may perceive local significance as being distinctive or unique, and therefore attractive, while on the other hand Gospodini (2004) suggests that they are more comfortable in international spaces. In fact, Smith and Ebejer propose that both aims can be achieved simultaneously, for instance by the development of tourism infrastructure (such as cruise terminal buildings) which not only reflects local identity and characteristics but also presents an 'iconic' appeal and international orientation. This might be illustrated by the cruise terminal in Sydney.

In relation to location of such tourism infrastructure, Law (1994) suggests that it is helpful to cluster tourism attractions together, to enable tourists to move between them and to maximise overall revenue benefits. Clearly, this has implications for the siting of infrastructure such as cruise passenger terminals, with a central location seeming to be desirable. Indeed, Reiner (2004) shows how cruise ship tourists visiting transit ports often stay within a tightly defined area or 'tourist bubble', though this also implies the need to avoid congestion, where possible, by allowing for some dispersion of passengers to a somewhat broader area, for instance by enhancing public transport, walkways such as waterfront boardwalks, direction signage, and information provision such as maps. This may be illustrated by the case of Saint John. In addition, it is desirable to have an appropriate

mix of uses within close proximity to the cruise terminal, partly to avoid congestion but also to allow local community needs to be met (Bruttomesso 2001; McCarthy 2003).

Another relevant factor, particularly for small-medium transit ports, is that their very nature may have led to persistent historical negative associations and image, often inherent within a port or industrial context, as illustrated by the cases of Sydney and Saint John. As Avraham and Ketter (2013) illustrate, a problematic image can present a major problem in attracting tourists, particularly in a context of increasing global competition for cruise ship visits. However, Avraham and Ketter identify two approaches to addressing such image problems. First, a 'cosmetic' approach relies largely on addressing the image, for instance via media or advertising. Second, a 'strategic' approach involves comprehensive action to change for instance by improving specific tourism attractions and infrastructure, in addition to associated marketing activity. They suggest that the latter approach offers more sustainable benefits. In addition, it may be argued that such activities should be to a degree context-dependent since, as Miles (2013) points out, the use of a 'prescribed formula' (61) for regeneration and cruise tourism development may be counter-productive if it erodes the distinctiveness of transit ports. This is part of a broader recognition on the part of many cruise destinations of the increasing need for distinctiveness of the cruise passenger visit experience as a whole, linked to local culture, and sharpened by increasing competition for cruise visitors (DiPietro and Peterson 2017). This is endorsed by Sung-ho et al. (2016), who highlight the importance of uniqueness as an attribute of cruise destination ports, together with intimacy, dynamism and traditionality.

These factors would seem to imply the need for a partnership approach within which all relevant stakeholders are involved, since this can ensure a strategic and sustainable approach to preserving or enhancing (rather than exploiting) the essential resources of the destination which serve as key attractors, and thereby maximising net benefits. Indeed, in contexts such as Australia, there have

been calls for more strategic guidance and control by the government to manage demand across the country, for instance via a national cruise tourism strategy (Dowling 2011). This is linked to the need to avoid environmental damage (Richins and Mayes 2008). While the latter does not seem to have such significance in Atlantic Canada, the need for sustainable cruise tourism is equally compelling with respect to the need for protection of historic heritage, for instance in the cases of Halifax and Saint John.

The research project and methodology

As indicated above, a rich literature has developed that addresses the experience of cruise tourism in many host cities – but this is largely directed at larger ports in globally popular regions such as the Caribbean and the Mediterranean, and so does not address for instance the increasing importance of smaller ship tourism. Moreover, while many studies focus on the needs and demands of cruise tourists, few address the specific implications for policy and practice on the part of city municipalities and port authorities. Consequently, the research project on which this article is based aimed to examine policy and practice by municipalities and port authorities (linked to the factors considered above) in relation to the development, operation and management of cruise ship tourism in selected small-medium transit ports in Atlantic Canada, particularly in terms of potential implications for improvement of policy and practice in other contexts, taking into account the need to maximize potential benefits and minimize potential problems. The research was undertaken by the author, and funded by the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland.

The Atlantic Canada region was selected because it is a growing cruise tourism destination with a variety of host cities in terms of scale. The selected cities comprised Halifax, Nova Scotia (pop. approx. 310,000); Saint John, New Brunswick (pop. approx. 210,000); and Sydney, Nova Scotia (pop. approx. 31,000). These cities were selected because they share basic similarities, for instance via their function

essentially as cruise ship transit ports (with Halifax also providing a dual function as a turnaround port), and the presence in each case of a cruise passenger terminal building/s. However, the cities also display a variety of sizes (within a small-medium sized banding in global terms) and local contexts, and consequently a range of potential benefits and problems, as well as varying elements of policy and practice in terms of cruise ship tourism development, operation and management. The cities are all partners of the Atlantic Canada Cruise Association which has five partner ports; there are eight other cruise tourist ports within this region, and the sample of three cities therefore represents around one quarter of the total number of cruise ports in the Atlantic Canada region. However, the research applied a qualitative approach using case studies which were not intended to present a sample that was statistically representative for a broader population; instead, the cases were chosen to allow consideration of relevant issues at a broad range of scales, with a degree of triangulation and comparison between cases, as well as consideration of how scale itself might impact on the issues considered. The intention was to therefore to describe and explain rather than to ensure a statistically valid sample, and it is recognised that the cases either individually or together do not necessarily generalise to a larger population.

The author arranged and carried out semi-structured, face-to-face interviews in three case study sites in Canada in April 2015. Interviewees were selected in these cities to represent the key stakeholders; these comprised the following: (1) economic development/business development organisations: (Halifax Partnership [one interview], Halifax Gateway Council [one interview], Uptown Saint John – Saint John Business Improvement Area [one interview]); (2) port authorities: (Port of Halifax [one interview], Sydney Ports Corporation [one interview], Port of Saint John [three interviews]); (3) urban planning organisations: (City of Saint John Planning Development [one interview]); and (4) tourism development organisations (Destination Halifax [one interview], Discover Saint John [one interview]). Consequently, the Halifax case involved four interviews, the Sydney case involved one interview, and the Saint John case involved five interviews;

the total number of interviews was ten. Again, the qualitative approach did not involve statistically valid sampling of a broader population of potential interviews within the case study area; instead, expert interviews were chosen in view of their potential insights into the relevant issues, and ‘snowball sampling’ was also used with some key agents identifying related potential respondents within the case study area.

The balance of interviewees in each context was based in part on scale (with Halifax and Saint John being larger in scale and with more complex institutional landscapes than Sydney, so necessitating more interviews). The complexity of local factors in relation to cruise tourism was also an issue in the selection of interviewees, with Saint John for instance involving a particularly contested set of issues around growth of cruise tourism and consequent competition for land use with the main port function, and so the additional interview specifically with the land use planner in Saint John was important in investigating this element.

The interview questions in all cases addressed the city’s experience of cruise tourism via potential benefits and growth trajectory, ongoing costs and problems, and the strategic and operational application of approaches, policies and practices for cruise tourism development, operation and management. Interviews were around one hour in duration. The interview data were analysed using content analysis to draw out key themes and issues, as set out in the analysis section below. In addition, relevant documents such as land-use plans, port authority reports and tourism reports from municipalities were used to corroborate the interview data.

Summary of case characteristics

Table One, below, illustrates the key characteristics of each of the three selected cases.

[Table One here]

The Case of Halifax

Overview

Halifax, the largest of the three ports considered, is the capital of the province of Nova Scotia and a major economic centre in eastern Canada, with a large concentration of government services and private sector companies. The city-region's key economic strength is in mainstream port activities; for instance, it is the largest autoport in North America with a throughput of 250,000 vehicles per annum, and is also a naval port. For cruise ship tourism, Halifax is a 'turnaround' port as well as a port of call, and served by 19 cruise lines. Moreover, the cruise ship tourism sector is seen as an important element within the economy of the city, and one that has performed very well in recent decades. For instance, the Council's *2010-2015 Strategic Plan* (Halifax Gateway Council 2010) shows how the growth in cruise passenger numbers from 1998-2008 significantly outpaced the average growth for other North American ports, and the city aims to have 407,000 cruise passengers by 2030 (interview, Halifax Partnership representative, April 20, 2015).

Organisational factors

An important factor enabling effective integration of cruise ship tourism with other sectors of economic and physical development is the range of organisational partnership mechanisms. In particular, the Halifax Partnership has provided an economic development function since 2004. It manages the Halifax Gateway Council, a public/private-funded forum for a range of stakeholders including transportation providers, which work together to improve the efficiency and competitiveness of the Halifax city-region, for instance by establishing business partnerships, conducting research, and marketing the city internationally (interview, Port of Halifax representative, April 21, 2015). In addition, the city's tourism sector is promoted by Destination

Halifax. The city (as well as others considered in this article) also benefits from membership of the Atlantic Canada Cruise Association, a regional partnership which assists with collaborative activity, sharing of information, and strategic marketing, and which also fosters collaboration with other ports in the region. These factors have enabled the encouragement of a collaborative organisational environment in relation to cruise ship tourism in Halifax (interview, Halifax Gateway Council representative, April 20, 2015).

Terminal infrastructure

The Halifax Cruise Pavilion Complex cruise terminal was completed in 2013, based on revitalised cargo sheds dating from 1928. The cruise lines themselves were not in favour of substantial funding for the terminal, since all they required was a basic 'box' facility. This would seem to be in part because cruise lines raise much revenue from on-shore excursions, and facilities such as shops in the terminal area can discourage this by diverting passengers' interest and spending. However, the multi-use nature of the terminal enables a wider base of income, including from conventions and conferences (interview, Port of Halifax representative, April 21, 2015). Piers 22 and 20 are the main cruise ship berths and offer direct access to dedicated passenger terminals, and the wide berth space allows space for several ships. Cruise ship passengers are encouraged to use the terminal facilities since pre-paid cards used on the ships can also be used in the terminal, with discounts on many goods available for cruise passengers (interview, Port of Halifax representative, April 21, 2015).

The scale and range of uses around the cruise ship terminal, including for instance brew-pubs and restaurants, an art gallery and artists' studios, create a critical mass for a positive visitor experience. The wider area includes a cluster of cultural uses attractive for cruise ship tourists, and the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design (NSCAD) – the oldest art college in North America – is close to the

terminal. Many art-related events are held in the area, and there is a vibrant music culture. In addition, associated activities in the area include a range of events such as a beer festival. Furthermore, the uses in and around the terminal have benefited from the emphasis placed by the city and port on creating a safe and attractive environment for the benefit of visitors and residents. The Waterfront Development Corporation assisted in the creation of this area, which was strategically important to the city's development by providing an important 'gateway' (interview, Halifax Gateway Council representative, April 20, 2015).

For passengers wishing to walk to the city, a boardwalk enables easy access. In addition, the terminal is served by a large number of tour buses for visitors to local attractions such as Peggy's Cove and Lunenburg; around half of passengers leaving cruise ships use such tours, and the city seeks to ensure their effective dispersal from the terminal area via taxi traffic as well as tour buses (interview, Halifax Gateway Council representative, April 20, 2015). The port also provides a range of services in relation to cruise ships, commensurate with its status as a turnaround port, as indicated below.

Cruise ship demand

In 2015, around 222,000 cruise passengers visited the city, with 141 cruise ship calls. In 2014, a significant boost to tourism was provided via the Titanic story on the 100th anniversary of the disaster, since Halifax had been the closest harbour. The city's natural advantages, including deep water, are considerable, and the extensive water-side and land-side infrastructure was an added attraction for cruise ship lines (interview, Destination Halifax representative, April 21, 2015). In addition, the location, on the route to Newfoundland and Labrador as part of broader cruise itineraries, is important for cruise lines. The historic linkage of the city to transatlantic cruise traffic is also helpful, since Sir Samuel Cunard, who founded the Cunard Line, was born in Halifax, and this link has been used for instance in trade magazines for the cruise industry. Tourism marketing of the city

emphasises distinctive local attractions such as the Anne of Green Gables Experience, as well as many other land-based attractions available via organised tours from Halifax (Cruise Halifax 2016), and joint marketing activity including Halifax as a destination is facilitated via the Atlantic Canada Cruise Association (interview, Destination Halifax representative, April 21, 2015).

As a 'turnaround port' (as well as a transit port), around 200-600 'turnarounds' take place per annum. The city is within the important New England-based cruise area which relies on the attractions of fall foliage colours, when many 'repositions' occur, with ships ending one cruise and embarking on another, often to the Caribbean (interview, Port of Halifax representative, April 21, 2015). Moreover, the city undertakes provisioning and refuelling of cruise ships; indeed, the city's strength as a 'turnaround port' was heightened in 2014 when the 'shore power' initiative was completed, the second such initiative in Canada. This allows cruise ships to plug in to electrical power when docked, and it reduces marine diesel air emissions since ships can shut down their auxiliary engines and connect to the electrical grid. It was part of a CAD 10 million co-operative funding arrangement between the Government of Canada, the Province of Nova Scotia and the Halifax Port Authority (Port of Halifax 2014). There have been limits to capacity in the past, but much work has been done on improving infrastructure, with strategic support from the Federal Government, and the terminal area now has the capacity to dock five cruise ships simultaneously

Operational factors

The cruise season typically lasts from April to October, and the peak of the 2014 cruise ship season was in September (interview, Halifax Port Authority representative, April 21, 2015). For port of call visits, ships typically arrive by 09.00 and depart by 18.00, so cruise ship passengers typically spend around eight hours in the city if they do not take a bus tour to an outside attraction. Since the experience of passengers is seen as important in encouraging repeat visits, the port uses

‘familiarisation’ activities such as ‘meet and greets’, with pipers, when passengers disembark, and such activities are tailored to the cruise ship visitor demographic. The port also operates ‘hop-on, hop-off’ tour buses for the downtown area for passengers not wishing to walk downtown (interview, Destination Halifax representative, April 21, 2015).

Problems

Since the city is an important working port with two container terminals, trucks delivering goods are sometimes delayed by congestion caused by cruise ship tour bus traffic (interview, Halifax Gateway Council representative, April 20, 2015). Overall, there is inevitably a challenge where a cruise ship terminal is located in the vicinity of a busy working (and expanding) port with much container traffic (interview, Halifax Port Authority representative, April 21, 2015). Nevertheless, since there is no significant residential population close to the terminal area, impacts on local residential populations may be presumed not to be significant (unlike for instance in the case of Victoria in British Columbia).

The Case of Sydney

Overview

Sydney is situated on the east coast of Cape Breton Island in Nova Scotia. The city was once an important industrial centre within eastern Canada, based on steel production (Peston 1978), but when this became uneconomic there was industrial decline, and the main employment is now in customer service call centres and tourism. The city is important for cruise tourism since it provides a gateway to Cape Breton Island, with its Gaelic heritage and attractive landscape, as well as local attractions such as the Cabot Trail.

Organisational factors

The Port of Sydney Development Corporation manages and develops land in the port area including the harbour and its infrastructure. As in the other cases in this article, the Atlantic Canada Cruise Association assists in joint marketing and promotion activities for cruise tourism (interview, Sydney Ports Corporation representative, April 23, 2015).

Terminal infrastructure

The Joan Harriss Cruise Pavilion (the cruise passenger terminal) includes a distinctive and iconic piece of public art reflecting local culture and providing a symbol for the city. This is a 55 foot-high sculpture, the 'Fidheal Mhor a' Ceilidh'. The terminal is within walking distance of the city centre, and incorporates a 15-seat auditorium/video theatre, a small art gallery/craft boutique, a restaurant and the Cape Breton Interpretation Centre. The upper and lower levels allow the building to be used as a venue for concerts, conventions, trade shows, meetings and weddings. A critical feature of the building is the versatility of the internal space; for instance, it includes a balcony area that can be used for private events. While the facility is too small to act as a formal conference venue, it can accommodate opening or closing events (interview, Sydney Ports Corporation representative, April 23, 2015). In addition, the building's lighting and distributed sound can be adapted to a variety of uses/events, allowing it to be used as a sophisticated concert venue. During the cruise season which lasts from May to October, a visitor information service with a kiosk is provided and volunteer 'ambassadors' distribute information to passengers.

Unlike in many other contexts, cruise operators lobbied for a high-quality terminal building, with a flexible and multi-use nature, in part to allow costs to be covered, and the facility now operates as a non-for-profit entity (interview, Sydney Ports Corporation representative, April 23, 2015). Since it

provides a significant gateway to the region and to Cape Breton Island in particular, Federal and Provincial funding was provided for signage and egress.

Cruise ship demand

Within the Region, Sydney competes for cruise ship visits with Saint John, and secondarily with Halifax. Around 75 ships per annum visit the city, and there are essential port services for cruise ships at the dock, including fresh water, fuel, gas and lubricants, minor repairs, and port operations services (Port of Sydney 2015). In 2009 there were 44 cruise ship calls with 62,340 passengers and 26,160 crew visitors, and it was estimated that 271 jobs were supported by cruise tourism in the city (Port of Sydney 2010). In 2015 there were 70 cruise ship calls with 89,664 passengers visiting, and in 2016 there were 57 cruise ship calls with 87,574 passengers visiting (Port of Sydney 2016b).

Operational factors

Bus tours and taxis (with the latter operating small-scale tours of the city) are available outside the terminal for passengers, and tours operate to attractions such as the Highland Village, a museum and cultural centre that celebrates the Gaelic experience in Nova Scotia, as well as other attractions such as the Bell Museum and Goat Island (Port of Sydney 2016a). Such tours are particularly important for repeat cruise visitors in view of the limited attractions in the city of Sydney itself (interview, Sydney Ports Corporation representative, April 23, 2015).

Problems

The port presently faces capacity issues in terms of the number of ships that can be accommodated, though there is (as of 2016) a planned expansion of the port area to allow a second berth which

could allow up to three cruise ships to berth at one time (Port of Sydney 2015). In fact in 2007 a second berth was anticipated by 2012 (CBCL et al. 2007). The proposed second berth is intended to allow the port to accommodate vessels exceeding 300m in length. This is needed because of current restrictions which have caused problems; for instance, the Holland America Group is the biggest customer of the port and the flagship Royal Princess ship, at 330 m in length, cannot access the port (Port of Sydney 2016a). A second berth has a projected cost of CAD 20 million but the Cape Breton Regional Municipality has confirmed a contribution of CAD 6,666,667 and the provincial government is seeking to confirm the balance (Port of Sydney 2016a). The provision of such a berth could potentially double the capacity of the port for cruise ships.

The Case of Saint John

Overview

Saint John is the largest city in New Brunswick, and the metropolitan area has a population of over 120,000. The economy is largely linked to the international container port function (Port of Saint John 2015), and, in 2014, 565,493 metric tonnes of containerised cargo passed through the city, as compared to the 2013 figure of 497,000 metric tonnes (itself an increase of 60% over 2012). Furthermore, in 2015 the port announced a strategic modernisation plan for the West Side cargo terminals to support continuing growth in this sector, with proposed funding from the Federal and Provincial governments as well as Port Saint John (Port of Saint John, 2015). The city is also the region's largest 'break-bulk' handling port, with dry bulk handling for recycled metal, potash, and salt (Port of Saint John 2014a). In addition, the city is increasingly important as a conference venue, and new innovative communications technology is a fast-growing sector. There is a significant cultural and visual arts presence with artists' studios and galleries: the city has the largest collection of public art in Atlantic Canada, and is one of the highest concentrations of art galleries per capita in

Canada (Uptown Saint John Inc. n.d.). It also hosts many events such as a Jazz and Blues Festival, an International Buskers' Festival and a Food Festival.

Like the other cases considered, Saint John became established as an important cruise tourism port due in part to its location and deep harbour. In addition, the uptown area is a major historic centre of interest (City of Saint John 2011). While the Great Fire of 1877 destroyed over 1,600 buildings in the area, a rebuilding programme resulted in the development of an area with many buildings listed as provincial and national historic sites, and the Trinity Royal Neighbourhood, a 20-block area, is now the largest Heritage Preservation Area in Canada. The area also contains Canada's oldest public market, the Saint John City Market, which is a significant attractor for cruise visitors (Uptown Saint John Inc. n.d.). The area's fine-grained, mixed-use nature, with 69 restaurants, pubs and cafes within five blocks of the harbour (where the cruise ship terminals are located), adds to its attractiveness to cruise ship visitors, who can easily walk to it, given its proximity to the cruise terminals on the uptown waterfront (interview, Uptown Saint John representative, April 27, 2015).

The appeal of the city for cruise passengers has been significantly enhanced as a result of the development and regeneration of the uptown area, with the creation for instance of new art galleries, restaurants and boutique retail outlets, and cultural events (interview, Uptown Saint John representative, April 27, 2015). The area has also experienced a resurgence as a residential community with older people moving in as a result of the down-sizing of 'baby-boomers' or 'empty-nesters' and the consequent development of residential uses such as loft apartments. In addition, a younger residential community is being attracted as a result of new IT-related start-ups which desire a location in the urban core, often via work-living uses, and there are now around 30 such businesses (interview with Discover Saint John representative, April 27, 2015). There has also been increased attention on the protection, repurposing and revitalisation of heritage buildings, using government grants. In all these aspects, the strategy of the city mayor to promote Saint John as a

‘renaissance city’ has been critical in this respect, (interview with Discover Saint John representative, April 27, 2015).

There has also been much recent development in the waterfront area, adjacent to uptown, organised by the Saint John Development Corporation. This includes Fundy Quay, a CAD 100 million redevelopment project incorporating six acres of residential and commercial development including a hotel, which together form a new neighbourhood area (Saint John Development Corporation n.d.). Earlier revitalisation projects in which the Corporation was involved include the redevelopment of Market Square, Harbour Station, Imperial Theatre, the City Market restoration, an indoor pedway in the uptown area (linking the Harbour Station entertainment/sports complex, the aquatic centre, and Market Square), and the 3.6km ‘harbour passage’ (a waterfront boardwalk). In addition, a Harbour Clean-up Project was completed in 2014 and wastewater in the Harbour now exceeds national guidelines. These initiatives have contributed to the vitality of the uptown area, which in turn contributes to its attractiveness to cruise tourists (Saint John Development Corporation n.d.).

Organisational factors

‘Discover Saint John’, part of the City of Saint John municipality, is an organisation which promotes tourism and marketing of the city. It has assisted in developing a visitor experience programme, funded by the municipality and the Saint John Hotel Association, which includes action to increase signage with relevance to visitors such as cruise passengers. In addition, ‘Uptown Saint John’, a business improvement area organisation, represents over 600 business and property owners located within an area of 20 blocks in uptown Saint John, and it works with the port and city to enhance the visitor experience so as to boost visitor spending (Uptown Saint John Inc. n.d.). For instance, the organisation is progressing (in 2015) plans to ensure the collection of information on passenger flows within the uptown area, to inform tourism development and economic development plans

(Saint John Development Corporation 2015). The Saint John Development Corporation seeks to ensure the overall development, management, co-ordination and advancement of the commercial, residential, recreational, cultural, social and economic welfare of the city's central area (Saint John Development Corporation n.d.).

Terminal infrastructure

The two cruise terminals in the city provide a range of facilities including meeting rooms and a roof top plaza, with potential for events such as weddings. The Marco Polo Cruise Terminal, completed in 2009, has a hall area of 548 square metres with a reception capacity of 600, and an assembly hall of 400 square metres with a reception capacity of 400 (Port of Saint John 2014b). It was designed to reflect aspects of historic captain's quarters, with a polished rustic space containing Douglas Fir wainscoting and floor-to-ceiling windows, and an open-concept space suited to trade shows and receptions. Overall, however, the building has limited scope to stage events (Port of Saint John 2014b). The terminal cruise ship berth has a capacity of 388m, and offers safe and secure ground transportation and shore excursion kiosks with a passenger pedway linking to the terminal (Cruise Saint John 2014).

By contrast, the newer Diamond Jubilee Cruise Terminal, developed in 2012, has greater scale to cope with events and passenger reception, and allows multi-level access for cruise ships. It is more sleek and modern in appearance than its predecessor, and was designed to allow the simultaneous welcoming of cruise passengers and holding of events such as conferences, meetings, trade fairs and weddings. It contains a rooftop plaza with a 360-degree view of the city, and even the glass hallway from the gangway to the shore has been used during events. The building has a main floor of 697 square metres with reception capacity for 300 people; there is a meeting room of 251 square metres with reception capacity for 200 people, and an associated lobby of 65 square metres with a

reception capacity for 50 people (Port of Saint John 2014b). The terminal berth has a capacity of 340m, and offers safe and secure ground transportation and shore excursion kiosks as well as live entertainment, and there is a passenger pedway linking to the terminal (Cruise Saint John 2014).

Both buildings were designed to ensure maximum natural light and views of the city, and both have significant off-street parking provision (Port of Saint John n.d.). There is also a street market in the area in summer, which benefits visitors using both terminals (interview, Port Saint John representative, April 27, 2015). In fact, in 2013, 25,000 people visited the terminals as part of venue rentals, and there were 64 events held within the terminal buildings, compared with 12 events in 2012; moreover, in 2014 there were 80 events held within the terminals (Port of Saint John 2014b).

Cruise ship demand

The cruise visit season in Saint John lasts from early May until fall, when many major cruise ship lines use the city as a port of call (interview, Port Saint John representative, April 27, 2015). In 2013, 166,616 cruise passengers and 63,318 crew members visited the city, the result of 63 cruise ship calls using 11 different cruise lines. In 2014, there were 106,501 passengers, with 43,139 crew members visiting, resulting from 49 cruise ship calls (Port of Saint John 2014b). While this represents a small downturn, the city had by 2014 experienced 26 cruise ship seasons and over two million cruise passenger visits (Port of Saint John 2015). Moreover, in 2014 there was a record number of days (11) when two cruise ships were docked in the port at the same time, and two days with three ships docked; there were also seven inaugural cruise ship calls and the port's 1000th ship call (Port of Saint John 2014b). The demographics of cruise visitors change during a typical season, with families visiting largely in the summer (when the wider region is most active for tourism) and older visitors more evident in the fall. However, visitor spending is not clearly associated with demographics or background, with more affluent visitors not always spending significantly more

money in the city, and crew often spending more per head compared to passengers (interview, Port Saint John representative, April 27, 2015).

In fact, cruise ship tourism is not seen as critical for the city in the context of tourism more widely, partly because cruise ship tourism is very seasonal, with activity typically largely confined to around 90 days per year in 2014 for instance the season lasted from May 11 to November 3 (interview, Port Saint John representative, April 27, 2015). However, cruise tourism is viewed as a valued component of the wider tourism mix, and, during the cruise ship tourism season, there are clear benefits for uptown uses such as shops, restaurants and art galleries. In fact 90% of cruise visitors decide to leave this ship during their visit, and around half of cruise ship visitors choose to walk around the historic uptown area, largely due to its close proximity to the cruise terminal, rather than take bus tours (interview, Port Saint John representative, April 27, 2015). There is evidence that cruise ship visits encourage subsequent visits in other modes (many return two or three times) since focus groups have shown that such visits increase the perceived validity of Saint John as a visitor destination for instance for visitors from Boston or New York. Consequently, cruise ship images are included in much tourism marketing information for the city (interview, Discover Saint John representative, April 27, 2015).

Furthermore, in Feb 2015, a consultation report by Dillon Consulting Ltd. concluded that Saint John was well-suited (given its relatively small scale) to a role as a home port for expedition-class ships. These are high-end vessels, typically carrying around 50-200 passengers in addition to crew members, and associated cruises are geared towards travellers with specific interests such as nature exploration. As indicated above, such niche cruise operations, using relatively small ships, are becoming increasingly popular globally. Consequently, in March 2015 the cruise operator Blount Small Ship Adventures confirmed that they would use the city as a homeport in 2015, with the provincial government also confirming that year that they would fund CAD 300,000 per annum, for

three years, for infrastructure including a new floating dock to accommodate the expedition-class ships (New Brunswick Canada 2014). Cruises from 2015 start or end in Saint John, and visit local ports including St. Andrews, Campobello and Grand Manan, as part of a 10-day itinerary to the north. The ship, carrying around 98 passengers, stays in Saint John for three days, taking on supplies (New Brunswick Canada 2014).

A particular advantage of this type of operation for the city is that, while typical day visitors spend an average of CAD 60-80 (Port of Saint John 2014), it is expected that passengers in this mode will spend up to double that amount, since spending is likely to include a hotel stay. Consequently, homeporting, even on a small scale, is seen as a significant enhancement of the city's cruise ship operation. It also allows other areas around the city to benefit more from cruise ship tourism since visitors using a home port are more likely to travel outside the city than day visitors (Port of Saint John 2014). It is also hoped that this initiative may prompt similar small ship cruise operations to use the port.

Operational factors

There is a well-developed 'meet and greet' programme for cruise ship visits, with use of pipers and handing-out of roses to passengers. In addition, welcome flags are put out when cruise ships visit which encourage visitors to walk around the central area, and guided walks are offered around the historic central area (interview, Port Saint John representative, April 27, 2015). Such initiatives are highly appreciated by visitors, as shown by survey data, since they significantly enhance the cruise visitor experience. In addition, staffed visitor information kiosks are sited in the immediate area (two in April 2015, with three more planned), and there are racks with city tourism brochures/maps sited throughout the central area of the city. These publications list all significant uses of interest and increase potential benefits for shops and restaurants. There have also been recent improvements to

signage in the uptown district, and new events have been organised for the King's Square public space, together with small-scale public art initiatives (some interactive). Effective communication with the local residential and business community is also seen as critical, for instance in terms of information on timing of cruise ship visits (interview, Port Saint John representative, April 27, 2015).

Problems

Since many cruise passenger visitors take bus tours, one challenge is to organise enough tour buses on busy cruise ship visit days. While vehicular congestion is not a significant issue in spite of the cruise ship terminals being sited adjacent to the city centre, there can be traffic delays when three cruise ships are docked in the city, and use of 'horse and buggy' transport from the terminal for cruise passengers has sometimes led to minor problems for other vehicles (interview, Port Saint John representative, April 27, 2015). In addition, while it is helpful that the area is able to absorb large numbers of passengers disembarking from cruise ships via the many streets and side streets in the uptown area, Main Street can sometimes become congested with pedestrians on busy days, with many cruise visitors walking from the terminal to the indoor market (interview, Uptown Saint John representative, April 27, 2015). There is nevertheless a spirit of general tolerance to such issues – indeed, cruise visitors are seen by many to add vitality, though this is perhaps facilitated by the dominant presence of business rather than residential uses in the area adjacent to the terminals (interview, Port Saint John representative, April 27, 2015). There are tidal issues which can restrict the time at which larger ships dock, but these do not act as a major constraint.

While the location of the port's cruise terminals adjacent to the city centre is helpful for the operation of cruise ship tourism, there is limited access to port-owned land for non-port development elsewhere in the uptown waterfront area, with use rezoning only practicable when land is sold. This perhaps indicates a potential degree of conflict with the remaining port-related

uses in this area, which could constrain aims for the wider diversification of uptown waterfront uses, linked to cruise tourism development. Nevertheless, the *City of Saint John Municipal Plan 2011* (City of Saint John, 2011) indicates that the uptown primary centre (adjacent to the two cruise passenger terminals), encompassing all significant office and government uses as well as other community uses including speciality retailing and arts/cultural/entertainment, is appropriate for further development of high-density residential uses and high-intensity mixed uses (policy LU-11).

Moreover, in the wider city planning context, a major issue has arisen from the potential future development of the southern end of the uptown waterfront, currently (in 2015) occupied by port-related industrial uses, with an upturn in this sector leading to pressure for further industrial development (interview, City of Saint John Planning Department, April 27, 2015). The dominance of port activities currently restricts access to the waterfront in this area, and there is local conflict over land use. One example of this is 'Tin Can Beach', officially known as Rockaway Beach, an area abandoned after the closure of the Lantic Sugar refinery in 2000. This is the last remaining piece of natural coastline on Saint John's inner harbour, and there is a clear community desire for the area to be used as a multi-purpose green space, though it has been the subject of ecological restoration efforts starting in 2014 and assisted by the Atlantic Coastal Action Program, including a beach clean-up, removal of invasive species and new tree planting (University of New Brunswick Saint John 2013).

Temporary uses have taken place here in recent years, reflecting the idea of 'tactical urbanism' as in the use of 'low-cost temporary additions to the built environment and art without sanctioning from state authorities' (University of New Brunswick Saint John 2013: 4). For instance, in late 2015 a local food promotion called Food Truck Wednesday involved mobile restaurants parking near the entrance to the beach and drawing customers from all over the city, and this initiative was subsequently used in Discover Saint John's tourism marketing content. This area perhaps again

highlights the potential dichotomy between the need for uses that meet community needs (including perhaps visitor needs) and those that accord with the historical dominance of local industries linked to port uses, which would seem to enjoy particular power and influence in relation to land use (Marquis 2009).

More generally, there are problems in the wider city of population loss and poor quality development, and vacant land. The region also has major problems of rural poverty and the rural population is the highest in Canada, which restricts the capacity for revenue-raising in the province (interview, City of Saint John Planning Department representative, April 27, 2015). Nevertheless, the recently developed municipal plan, the first in thirty years, is attempting to address such issues in strategic terms (interview, City of Saint John Planning Department representative, April 27, 2015).

Discussion

The research results set out above highlight a range of relevant possibilities in relation to policy and practice in maximising benefits and minimising problems with reference to cruise ship tourism in small-medium host ports. The aim of the research, and of this article, is to highlight areas of potentially effective policy and practice in this respect, with a view to implications for similar contexts facing similar problems. In order to do so, it is necessary to evaluate the elements highlighted in the results. In this regard, it is useful to consider the criteria applied by McCarthy and Romein (2014) in their evaluation of cruise passenger terminals in Amsterdam and Rotterdam, from the viewpoint of assessing effective urban regeneration practice. Specifically, they adapt the framework of Carmona (2001), in assessing sustainable urban design, by grafting a broader dimension in relation to economic and social factors. They therefore propose the following evaluation criteria: economic regeneration; stewardship and resilience; resource efficiency; diversity and choice; human needs; concentration and self-sufficiency; distinctiveness; and pollution reduction. However, the research project outlined above

was more broadly framed, concerning the operation of cruise tourism within which physical infrastructure and land use was only one component. In this context, the analysis of Klein (2011), as outlined above, is instructive in highlighting the need for consideration to be given also to the distributional effects arising from cruise tourism; linked to this, the particular importance of partnership between key stakeholders and a strategic approach may also be suggested.

By combining and integrating these conceptual frameworks, and taking account of the issues highlighted in the cases considered above, the following themes have been used as a framework for analysis for the data set out above: (1) appropriate facilities and infrastructure, and activities to support and encourage cruise tourism and enhance the visitor experience; (2) integration of appropriate mixed uses in the locality of the cruise terminal; (3) pedestrian access; (4) relationship and integration between the port authority and the municipality; and (5) addressing differences in the interests of wider stakeholders. These integrate consideration of sustainable design together with responsible cruise tourism practice, and can be used to highlight the way that practice in the operation and management of cruise tourism can maximise the net benefits arising from this activity for host cities. These themes are considered in more detail below in relation to the case study results set out above.

(1) Appropriate facilities and infrastructure, and activities to support and encourage cruise tourism and enhance the visitor experience

This relates to the provision of cruise terminals and berthing facilities, as well as associated transport infrastructure and related facilities on or near terminals including for instance shops, restaurants and, bars. Also of relevance here are operational initiatives to enhance the tourism experience and so maximise sustainable benefits by encouraging repeat visits; such activities could include provision and distribution of information, use of events, and management of cruise tourism passenger flows.

The cases considered above indicate the importance of the need to provide effective infrastructure such as cruise ship terminals. As indicated previously, there is often a desire from cruise lines for such facilities to be basic and minimal, potentially as a result of cost minimisation as well as a concern to avoid competitive spending possibilities for passengers (since cruise lines raise much income from selling tours). However, all the cases above would appear to illustrate the value of effective infrastructure including cruise terminals, since these have the potential to enhance the visitor experience and to allow potential use of facilities by local communities. Moreover, the benefits of and potential for use flexibility within such facilities is highlighted in particular by the case of Sydney's cruise passenger terminal, albeit on a relatively small scale. In terms of capacity limitations, this would seem to be factor in Sydney in particular, and to a lesser degree in Saint John, but not significantly in Halifax.

As indicated above, the issue of infrastructure is linked to the differing priorities of key agents such as cruise lines and port/city authorities. Linked to this, as Klein (2011) has highlighted, many ports of call have implemented cruise terminal facilities that in retrospect would seem not to have been necessary and that were largely to the benefit of cruise lines (by cutting costs) rather than to host cities. Nevertheless, it seems clear from the cases considered that high-quality infrastructure can bring benefits for all stakeholders, and can facilitate a more effective distribution of benefits and costs arising from cruise ship tourism, with some (potential) benefits for local host communities that might otherwise face the majority of 'costs' (such as externalities including pollution) and few (if any) of the benefits. This might also seem to corroborate to a degree the assertion of Smith and Ebejer (2011) that tourism infrastructure can reflect local identity and characteristics while also presenting an 'iconic', international appeal. This might be argued to be illustrated for instance by the cruise terminal in Sydney, and perhaps also to a degree in the cases of Halifax (by including a range of cultural uses in the immediate vicinity) and Saint John (by the detailing in the latest cruise terminal).

In overall terms, it may be argued that the cities considered have taken to a degree the approach advocated by Avraham and Ketter (2013) in terms of a strategic rather than a cosmetic approach to tourism development, since each has sought to invigorate the physical infrastructure experienced by tourists, including for instance cruise passenger terminals, and, in the case of Saint John in particular, the immediate physical environment in the uptown district. In addition, the cases would seem to illustrate the benefits (illustrated by Law [1994]) of the clustering of tourism activities, uses and infrastructure, with implications for siting cruise passenger terminals close to urban centres where related tourism attractions are available. In addition, in Saint John, there is evidence of infrastructure to disperse passengers to a broader area (as implied by Reiner [2004]) in order to minimise congestion and improve the overall quality of the tourism experience.

The cases also illustrate the value and importance of assertive action to welcome cruise passengers and to provide appropriate information relating to the city and region. As indicated above, this would seem to be particularly important for encouraging repeat visits either by cruise ship or by another mode, with the latter likely to lead to greater visitor spend per head.

(2) Integration of appropriate mixed uses in the locality of the cruise terminal

This relates to the mixing of land uses in the area immediately adjacent to the cruise terminal, including for instance retail and leisure/cultural uses, and the way in which these can be most effectively integrated with cruise tourism activities and uses. It includes broader consideration of spatial planning policies and their application in relation to cruise tourism, including intensification of uses.

The cases would seem to highlight the benefits of a high-density, mixed-use area adjacent to the cruise ship terminal, since this can enhance the appeal of the city for day visitors, many of whom

choose not to take a bus tour out of the city. This may be particularly valuable where there is a significant proportion of repeat visitors, as highlighted above in the case of Sydney. However, the case of Halifax is perhaps exemplary in this context, in view of the range and variety of facilities and uses in close proximity to the main terminal area; this illustrates the capacity for cruise terminal facilities to form a focal point for many other tourism- and entertainment-based uses in cruise port cities. Of course this would seem to be in part the result of the larger scale of Halifax, and the consequent capacity and demand for uses such as higher education and museums for instance. Nevertheless, there are clear implications for smaller contexts considering new terminal facilities, since there are clear potential benefits from locating these close to appropriate mixed-use areas. Moreover, in smaller contexts with existing terminal facilities, land use planning and related policy can encourage greater use mixing in the immediate area, with potential synergies available as in larger contexts, albeit at a smaller scale.

(3) Pedestrian access

This refers to access by pedestrians to the wider area within which the cruise terminal is located, including the waterfront, which affords particular benefits in for both visitors and local communities, and accords with wider established criteria in relation to sustainable design and land use.

In fact, all the cases would seem to illustrate to varying degrees the importance of public access to the waterfront for cruise ship visitors, ideally allowing pedestrian access from the terminal to the city centre. This was seen as a particularly significant asset in the case of Halifax and Sydney, assisted by development of boardwalks which links to the city centre and, in the case of Halifax, involving additional attractions on the route. Again, such access is also a key potential benefit for local communities which might otherwise lose their connection with the waterfront area as a result of commercial development for tourism and related uses. Waterfront access was also available in the

case of Saint John, though in the latter case the terminals are in any event located in the centre of the waterfront area. However, the case of Saint John also showed how some port-owned areas of the city's waterfront close to the cruise passenger terminals are contested in terms of the desire by local communities for greater access and communal use/recreation, which would seem to have potential benefits for tourism more generally.

(4) Relationship and integration between the port authority and the municipality

This relates to the way in which the relationship between the port authority and the municipality in particular is effective in maximising overall net outcomes from cruise tourism. It incorporates activities such as planning for management of cruise tourism; planning for cruise tourism infrastructure (including transport); marketing and information provision for cruise tourism; and provision of support and guidance for cruise tourists.

In this context, an important difference can be seen between the cities of Halifax and Saint John (which are somewhat comparable in scale, as compared to the smaller scale of Sydney) in terms of the degree of partnership working and strategic development related to economic development activities such as cruise ship tourism involving the port and city authorities. Essentially, in Halifax there is evidence of partnership at all levels and particularly regarding strategic development, with the uptown area (where the cruise terminal and associated uses are located) being seen by all stakeholders as unsuitable for ongoing industrial/port development and appropriate for tourism-related uses for instance. Indeed, all interviewees in Halifax stressed the importance of partnership between the major stakeholders for strategic planning, development and marketing activities related to cruise ship tourism. The level of 'institutional thickness' (Amin and Thrift 1995; Beer and Lester 2015) would seem to be critical in this context. The term refers to the density or volume of institutional structures or organisations in an area, which exist to support regional economic activity

and growth. This is demonstrated for instance via the presence of the Halifax Partnership and Halifax Gateway Council, as well as the historic application of principles of partnership geared to economic growth within the city-region.

However, in Saint John, there is more limited evidence of partnership, particularly between the port and the city in particular. This may be due in part to the smaller scale of Saint John as compared with Halifax, with port and city uses in closer proximity in Saint John and therefore more subject to competition between them. It may also be related to local economic priorities and the historic power of industrial interests in city development in Saint John. Also of relevance is the more positive ongoing level of economic development within the city-region in Halifax, with shipbuilding in particular providing a major economic sector and source of growth, but with Saint John being more challenged as a less wealthy city than Halifax, and with the ongoing problem of the need to consolidate tax revenues – though this does not wholly explain a less conducive orientation to partnership working. There would certainly seem to be a more positive history of partnership working in Halifax than in Saint John, and in the latter, the remaining port-related industries have been perhaps more dominant in affecting strategic decisions in the city as a whole, and perhaps more assertive in protecting their interests within city development agendas. This would seem to have worked against the effective operation of partnership in the wider context of city development and economic growth including tourism development.

(5) Addressing differences in the interests of wider stakeholders

This relates to the potential differences in interest between cities (both municipalities and port authorities) and cruise operators, as well as within municipalities (for instance between local communities and municipal organisations).

In terms of the relationship of cities with cruise operators, the cases illustrate a broad acceptance of joint interest in cruise tourism on the part of both; this may be in part because they are small-medium cruise ports, and therefore do not experience the greater vulnerability to the changing needs of demands of cruise operators faced by smaller cruise ports, or the more evident imbalance in benefits and costs in such contexts, for instance with economic benefits accruing mainly to cruise companies. It may also be related to the relatively buoyant nature of cruise activity in the region, with growth in the sector expected in all the case study ports. It might also be affected by the relatively limited number of alternative transit ports for cruise operators in the region.

Certainly, there is clear recognition of joint interest within the cases in most aspects of cruise tourism development, including for instance the need to encourage repeat cruise passenger visits. In each of the cases many cruise ship passengers were repeat cruise visitors (typically comprising 35-45% of total passenger numbers) and, to sustain such visits, there was broad acceptance that transit ports need to ensure they maximise the variety of attractions to cater for those not wishing to take bus tours, as highlighted above in the case of Sydney in particular, though, of course, if repeat visitors choose another mode, such as overland, benefits accrue to the cities but not the cruise lines. In addition, however, there was broad acceptance in the cases of the need for appropriate infrastructure, and, in the case of Sydney, the cruise operators actively lobbied for a sophisticated, mixed-use terminal development. This relative commonality of view across cities and cruise companies presents a contrast with much European experience, as illustrated by the experience of the European Union Gateway North Sea project considered above. Furthermore, the cases did not highlight particular differences relating to the interests of local communities and other stakeholders, though this would seem to be in part due to the lack of significant local residential communities in the cities concerned (as distinct from many other port cities).

In spite of this broadly positive experience, there of course remain important potential differences in interest between cruise ports/communities and cruise operators (particularly as highlighted by Klein [2011]), which may become more evident if cruise tourism activities (and associated benefits and costs) continue to increase as a proportion of overall city economic activity. As McCarthy and Romein (2012) indicate, the expansion of cruise tourism beyond a notional threshold or carrying capacity can lead to unacceptable costs (particularly for local communities but also for local business/retail uses for instance which might suffer from traffic congestion for instance), with the potential need for limits to be set on tourism activity. It may be argued that the effective management and operation of cruise tourism, and the implementation of suitable partnership arrangements between ports and cities, can forestall the need for such limits by mitigating problems, as would seem to be occurring in the cases considered, with implications for other contexts. Nevertheless, in broader terms, there would seem to remain the need for cruise port cities acting as transit ports to be assertive in protecting and enhancing the potential of their cities for sustainable tourism, including cruise ship tourism, and to take action to minimise the potential imbalance in the distribution of costs and benefits arising from such activity. This can assist in promoting the practice of 'responsible cruise tourism' as proposed by Klein (2011).

Of course there are clear limitations to the research and analysis outlined above, particularly in terms of its limited sample range and geographical area of focus, which restrict the potential for transferability of the results and implications to different contexts. However, within small-medium host cities for cruise tourism where demand is increasing or stable, it may be argued that such elements of effective policy and practice as highlighted above may be usefully applied to the benefit of these cities. Clearly, there are also implications for the need for future research in this area, perhaps within different geographical contexts, and/or areas or cities which experience more varied types of cruise tourism.

Conclusions

Small-medium cruise ports globally would seem to be set to become increasingly important as host cities for cruise ships. While there can be clear benefits arising for port cities and local communities, much experience has also highlighted associated problems, often related to the scale of the city compared with the number of cruise passengers visiting. Moreover, there are clear inequities in the distribution of benefits and problems, as well as different (and sometimes incompatible) differences between the needs of cruise lines, and port/city authorities (and sometimes between port and city authorities). However, there is a very limited literature considering specific policy and practice implications for small-medium cruise ports (specifically by municipalities and port authorities) in terms of action to maximise benefits and minimise problems/costs. This article therefore adds significantly to this literature by evaluating the experience in this respect of the cases of Halifax, Sydney and Saint John in Atlantic Canada. These cases indicate the potential for maximising net benefits for host cities from cruise tourism by the provision of mechanisms and capacity for partnership in strategic planning, appropriate infrastructure including a diversity of uses close to the cruise terminal area, and operational management which takes into account the needs of all stakeholders. The cases have clear implications for policy and practice in small-medium cruise ports in other contexts.

References

Amin, A. and Thrift, N. (1995) 'Globalisation, institutional "thickness" and the local economy', in P. Healey, S. Cameron, S. Graham and A. Mandani-Pour (eds), *Managing Cities: the New Urban Context* (New York: John Wiley).

Andriotis, K. and Agiomirgianakis, G. (2010), 'Cruise Visitors' Experience in a Mediterranean Port of Call'. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 12: 390-404.

Andriotis, K., Agiomirgianakis, G. and Mihiotis, A. (2007) 'Tourist vacation preferences – the case of mass tourists to Crete. *Tourism Analysis* 12(1-2): 51-63.

Avraham, E. and Ketter, E. (2013) 'Marketing Destinations with Prolonged Negative Images: Towards a Theoretical Model'. *Tourism Geographies: An International Journal of Tourism Space, Place and Environment* 15(1): 145-164.

Beer, A. and Lester, L. (2015) 'Institutional thickness and institutional effectiveness: developing regional indicators for policy and practice in Australia'. *Regional Studies* 2(1): 205-228.

Brida, J.G., Del Chaippa, G., Meleddu, M. and Pulina, M. (2011). 'The perceptions of an island community towards cruise tourism: A factor analysis'. *Tourism*: 60(1): 29-42.

Brida, J.G., Del Chiappa, G., Meleddu, M. and Pulina, M. (2012). 'Cruise Tourism Externalities and Residents' Support: A Mixed Approach'. *Economics* 6: 2012-40.

Brida, J.G., Del Chiappa, G., Meleddu, M. and Pulina, M. (2014). 'A Comparison of Residents' Perceptions of Two Cruise Ports in the Mediterranean Sea'. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 16: 180-190.

Bruttomesso (2001) 'Complexity on the Urban Waterfront', in R. Marshall (ed) *Waterfronts in Post-Industrial Cities*, pp 39-50 (London: E and FN Spon).

Butler, R.W. (1999) 'Sustainable tourism: A state-of-the-art review'. *Tourism Geographies: An International Journal of Tourism, Space, Place and Environment* 1(1): 7-25.

Carmona, M. (2001) 'Sustainable Urban Design – A Possible Agenda', in A. Layard, S. Davoudi and S. Batty (eds), *Planning for a Sustainable Future*, pp 165-192 (London: Spon Press).

CBCL Ltd., Bermello Ajamil and Partners, Inc., and Martin Associates (2007) *Port of Sydney Master Plan*, Sydney: Port of Sydney.

CBRM (2010) *Integrated Community Sustainability Plan*, Sydney: Port of Sydney.

City of Saint John (2011) *City of Saint John Municipal Plan*, Saint John: City of Saint John.

Cruise Halifax (2016) 'Attractions' [online], available at: <http://cruisehalifax.ca/our-city/attractions/> (accessed 20/12/2016).

Cruise Lines International Association (CLIA) Australasia (2013) *Cruise Industry Source Market Report*, CLIA Australasia: Sydney.

DiPietro, R.B and Peterson, R. (2017) 'Exploring Cruise Experiences, Satisfaction, and Loyalty: The Case of Aruba as a Small-Island Tourism Economy'. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration* 18(1): 41-60.

Douglas, N. and Douglas N. 2005. 'Small ship cruising', in *Niche Tourism*, edited by M. Novelli, 145-155. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Dowling, R. (2011) 'Research note: the growth of cruising in Australia'. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 18: 117-120.

Duman, T. and Mattila, A.S. (2005) 'The role of affective factors on perceived cruise vacation value'. *Tourism Management* 26: 311-323.

European Union Cruise Gateway North Sea Project (2012) *Decision Criteria for Cruise Port Selection in the North Sea Region* (Luxembourg: European Union Gateway North Sea).

Euthimiadou, V. (2001) *The relationship between urban visitors' motivation, activities and satisfaction with the city*. Paper presented at the Growth in Travel and Tourism TTRA European Conference, Kiruna, Sweden, 22-23 April.

Gabe, T.M., Lynch, C.P., and McConnon, J.C. (2006) 'Likelihood of cruise ship passengers return to a visited port: the case of Bar Harbor, Maine. *Journal of Travel Research* 44: 281-287.

Gospodini, A. (2004) 'Urban morphology and place identity in European cities: Built Heritage and innovative design'. *Journal of Urban Design* 9(2): 225-248.

Halifax Gateway Council (2010) *2010-2015 Strategic Plan – Building the Halifax Gateway*, Halifax: Halifax Gateway Council.

Henthorne, T.L. (2000) 'An analysis of expenditures by cruise ship passengers in Jamaica'. *Journal of Travel Research* 38: 246-250.

Klein, R. (2011) 'Responsible Cruise Tourism: Issues of Cruise Tourism and Sustainability'. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 18(1): 107-118.

Larsen, S. and Wolff, K. (2016) 'Exploring assumptions about cruise tourists' visits to ports'. *Tourism Management Perspectives* 17: 44-49.

Law, C. (1993) *Urban Tourism: Attracting Visitors to Large Cities*. New York: Mansell.

Marquis, G. (2009) 'Regime or Coalition? Power relations and the Urban Agenda in Saint John, 1950-2000'. *Journal of Enterprising Communities* 3(4):355-368.

McCarthy, J. (2003) 'Spatial Planning, Tourism and Regeneration in Historic Port Cities. *disP – The Planning Review* 39(154): 19-25.

McCarthy, J. (2004) 'Tourism-related Waterfront Development in Historic Cities: Malta's Cottonera Project'. *International Planning Studies* 9(1): 43-64.

McCarthy, J. (2006) 'The cruise industry and port city regeneration: The case of Valetta'. *European Planning Studies* 11(3): 341-352.

McCarthy, J. and Romein, A. (2012) 'Cruise Passenger Terminals, Spatial Planning and Regeneration: the case of Amsterdam and Rotterdam'. *European Planning Studies* 29(12): 2033-2052.

Miles, S. (2013) 'Contrived Liminality and the Commodification of the Post-Industrial Waterfront', in P. Gilchrist, T. Carter and D. Burdsey (eds), *Coastal Cultures: Liminality and Leisure, Leisure Studies Association Publication No. 126* (Brighton: Leisure Studies Association).

New Brunswick Canada (2014) 'Saint John to become a home port for cruise line', [online], available at: http://www2.gnb.ca/content/gnb/en/news/news_release.2014.03.0247.html (accessed 19/12/2015).

Port of Halifax (2014) 'Cruise vessels can now plug in at Port of Halifax', [online], available at: <http://portofhalifax.ca/2014/10/26/cruise-vessels-can-now-plug-in-at-port-of-halifax/> (accessed 19/12/2015).

Peston, R.E. (1978) 'The Evolution of Urban Canada: "The Post-1867 period"' in R.M. Irving (ed.) *Readings in Canadian Geography* (3rd edition), pp 19-46, Toronto: Holt, Rinehard and Winston.

Port of Saint John (n.d.) *Port Saint John Venues*, Saint John: Port of Saint John.

Port of Saint John (2014a) *Port Saint John: forging ahead*, Saint John: Port of Saint John.

Port of Saint John (2014b) *Convergence; Port Saint John Annual Report 2014*, Saint John: Port of Saint John.

Port of Saint John (2015) *Turning Opportunities into Growth: Port Saint John Annual Report 2015*, Saint John: Port of Saint John.

Port of Sydney (2015) *Positioned for Success: business prospectus*, Sydney: Port of Sydney.

Port of Sydney (2016a) *Moving Forward*, Sydney: Port of Sydney.

Port of Sydney (2016b) *Cruise News*, Sydney: Port of Sydney.

Pulina, M., Meleddu, M. and Del Chaippa, G. (2013). 'Residents' choice probability and tourism development'. *Tourism Management Perspectives* 5: 57-67.

Reiner, J. (2004) 'Beyond the Tourist Bubble? Cruiseship Passengers in Port'. *Annals of Tourism Research* 31(1): 44-60.

Richins, H. and Mayes, G. (2008). 'Historical Progression of Sustainable Management Concerning Marine Tourism Activities: A Case Study in Eastern Australia'. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning and Development* 5(2): 97-112.

Rodrigue, P. and Notteboom, T. 2013. 'The geography of cruises: Itineraries, not destinations'. *Applied Geography* 38:31-42.

Ross, G.F. (1993) 'Destination evaluation and vacation preferences'. *Annals of Tourism Research* 20: 477-489.

Saint John Development Corporation (n.d.) *Saint John Urban and Waterfront Development: Positioned for Growth*. Saint John: Saint John Development Corporation.

Saint John Development Corporation (2015) *Moving Forward*. Saint John: Saint John Development Corporation.

Shone, M.C., Wilson, J., Simmons, D.G. and Stewart, E.J. (2017) 'Sailing into Stormy Waters? Understanding the Community Impacts of Cruise Tourism Growth in Akaroa, New Zealand', in R. Dowling and C. Weeden (eds), *Cruise Ship Tourism* 2nd ed. (Wallingford: CAB International).

Smith, A. and Ebejer, J. (2011) 'Outward versus inward orientation of island capitals: the case of Valletta'. *Current Issues in Tourism* 15(1-2): 137-152.

Stewart, E.J., Dawson, J. and Draper, D. 2011. 'Cruise Tourism and Residents in Arctic Canada: Development of a Resident Attitude Typology'. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 18(1): 95-108.

Sung-ho, I., Myng-Hwa, N. and Jung-hoon, K. (2016) 'The Impact of the Personality of Cruise Port of Call on Port of Call Attachment and Behavioural Intention'. *International Journal of Smart Business and Technology* 4(2): 7-10.

Uptown Saint John Inc. (n.d.) *Uptown Saint John*, Saint John: Uptown Saint John Inc.

University of New Brunswick Saint John (2013) *From Trash to Treasure: Community Placemaking at Tin Can Beach*, Saint John: University of New Brunswick Saint John.

Ward, D. 2014. *Cruising and Cruise Ships*. London: Berlitz.

Watson, A. (2016) 'Cruise traffic increase', *The Scotsman*, 11th March: 16.

Weeden, C., Lester, J. and Thyne, M. (2011) 'Cruise Tourism: Emerging Issues and Implications for a Maturing Industry'. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 18: 26-29.

Table One: Summary of Case Characteristics (Source: Author)

Port/characteristic	Halifax	Sydney	Saint John
Size of host city	310,000	31,000	210,000
Key organisations related to the cruise tourism function within the city	Halifax Partnership, Halifax Gateway Council		Uptown Saint John (Business Improvement Organisation), Saint John Development Corporation
Terminal infrastructure	Halifax Cruise Pavilion Complex	Joan Harriss Cruise Pavilion	Marco Polo Cruise Terminal, Diamond Jubilee Cruise Terminal
No. of cruise ship calls in 2015	141	70	60
Approx. no. of cruise passengers in 2015	222,000	89,000	120,000
Capacity for simultaneous cruise ship docking	5 ships	1 ship	3 ships
Services / facilities available to cruise ship passengers	Meet and greet, wide variety of retail and cultural facilities within terminal area	Meet and greet, limited services in terminal, limited services / facilities in city	Meet and greet, wide variety of retail and cultural facilities within adjacent uptown area
Services to cruise ship operators	Basic docking and ship servicing, shore power service allowing electrical power for ships when docked	Basic docking and ship servicing	Basic docking and ship servicing

